

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/619,623 | 07/16/2003 | Daiya Yamashita | 2830-0139P | 7297 |
| 2292 | 7590 07/07/2005 | | EXAM | INER |
| | EWART KOLASCH & | DINH, TIEN QUANG | | |
| PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | , | 3644 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003 | 5 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| • | · | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | 10/619,623 | YAMASHITA ET AL. | | | |
| | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | | Tien Dinh | 3644 | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply | appears on the cover sheet | with the correspondence address | | | |
| THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any r | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO msions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stately received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | N. R. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may reply within the statutory minimum of iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) M atute, cause the application to become | a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) | Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | |
| <i>,</i> — | 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) 🗌 | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 4 53 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | • | | | | |
| 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ | Claim(s) 3-10 and 21-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 3-10, 21-25 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | |
| 9) 🗌 🤈 | The specification is objected to by the Exam | niner. | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority u | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| • | | | | | | |
| Attachmen | t(s) | | | | | |
| 1) Notic 2) Notic 3) Inform | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB r No(s)/Mail Date | Paper N | w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/619,623

Art Unit: 3644

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10, and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Mendham and Huet or Janicke et al.

Wright discloses a blade member having a first and second outer skin with wall thickness that changes and a central portion that is thicker than the leading and trailing edge, reinforcing area 9 and 7, and the blade member being made out of an alloy (see column 1, line 67 and all of the figures). However, Wright is silent on the outer skins, inner skins, and reinforcing area being integrally formed by wire electrical discharge-machining from a single block. However, Mendham discloses an aircraft part being formed by wire electrical discharge-machining is well known in the art. Huet or Janicke et al discloses forming integral parts from a block is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have made the Wright's blade system integrally formed from a block by using wire electrical discharge-machining as taught by Mendham and Huet or Janicke et al to create a stronger unitary and more efficient blade.

Please note that in claims 1 and 22, the at least one reinforcing area is interpreted as element 9. This would read upon the claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/619,623

Art Unit: 3644

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright as modified by Mendham and Huet or Janicke et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Camping et al.

Wright as modified by Mendham and Huet or Janicke et al discloses all claimed parts except for the substantially flat second outer skin. Camping et al teaches that a substantially flat second outer skin (see figure 4) is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have made the Wright's blade second outer skin substantially flat as taught by Camping et al to increase lift.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright as modified by Mendham and Huet or Janicke et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Platt et al.

Wright as modified by Mendham and Huet or Janicke et al discloses all claimed parts except for a portion adjacent to the first of two reinforcing area being thicker than a portion adjacent to a second of two reinforcing area. However, Platt et al teaches that a portion adjacent to a reinforcing area (the one nearest to the leading edge in figure 7) being thicker than another portion adjacent to a separate reinforcing area (the one that is closest to the trailing edge in figure 7) is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have made the portion adjacent to the first reinforcing area 9 of Wright be thicker than the second reinforcing area 7 of Wright as taught by Platt et al to make the propeller blade stronger.

Art Unit: 3644

Response to Arguments

The Examiner has used newly cited references Huet or Janicke et al to reject the amended claims. This renders the applicant's arguments moot.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tien Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-6899. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TD

Tien ol